



Meeting Notes

June 3, 2011

Attendees	
Members: <input type="checkbox"/> Bill Kaage – NWCG <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Douglas MacDonald – I-Chiefs <input type="checkbox"/> Elizabeth Strobridge - NGA <input type="checkbox"/> Glenn Gaines – DHS – USFA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Erickson - ITC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Karels - NASF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kirk Rowdabaugh - DOI <input type="checkbox"/> Mary Jacobs – NLC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ryan Yates – NACo <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Harbour – USFS	Support Staff: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Roy Johnson – DFO – OWF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shari Shetler – Exec. Sec. – OWF Others: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ann Walker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vicki Christiansen <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rich Lasko <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kate D'Ambrosio <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patti Blankenship <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

#	Topic
1	Welcome/Introductions 1. The meeting was brought to order by the Tom Harbour, chair, at 10:00
2	Meeting Objectives & Expectations <u>Description:</u> Outline the objectives and expectations of this meeting Reviewed the agenda for today's meeting <u>Outcome:</u> 1. Understanding what we need to accomplish <u>Key Points:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed the agenda for today's meeting Identified the non-cohesive strategy agenda items to remind the WFEC that it was not established for the sole purpose of providing oversight and direction for the cohesive strategy Think about future agenda items <u>Reference Material:</u> Final WFEC Agenda <u>Decisions:</u> None <u>Actions:</u> None
3	CS Sub-Committee reports <u>Description:</u> Sub-Committees will report on the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Identify actions, milestones and deliverables that were to be accomplished between the April WFEC meeting and now. Report on actual accomplishments during that time period. Identify actions, milestones and deliverables planned to be completed between now and the June 17 WFEC meeting. Identify any issues or barriers that need to be resolved.



Meeting Notes

June 3, 2011

#	Topic
	<p>5. Identify what, if anything is needed from WFEC.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understanding of the activities of each sub-committee. 2. Agreement on any modifications to deliverables or timelines 3. Identify of next steps to resolve any pending issues and/or barriers <p><u>Reference Material:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Committee Status Reports <p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSSC Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 3 Status Report for the CSSC ○ Note that at May 6 meeting – we (WFEC) requested that CSSC answer the questions posed by the WRSC ○ All 24 CRAFT questions will now be answered by all of the subcommittees ○ Allows consistency between the subcommittees ○ CSSC – contemplating communications both internal and external relating to Phase 2 ○ Will set up 2 webinars ○ Each RSC should identify a point of contact to answer any questions ○ Issue heard through Jenna with regard to the relationship between the CSSC and the National Science Committee – Will ask both the CSSC and National Science Committee to bring their recommendations back to WFEC • Western Regional Strategy Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ West has established a working group ○ The west will use the CRAFT process and answer the 24 questions. ○ June 15 – 17 – full three days in Boise to work through the CRAFT process ○ Contract – July 20 – July 22 to work with focus groups ○ Names have been submitted to participate on these working groups ○ Somewhere around July 1 – 8 they will meet face to face to work on their deliverables ○ Conference Calls are every other Friday ○ No list of Working Group members yet • NE Region Strategy Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lots of great folks participating in the NE Region ○ There will not be independent sub-regions ○ There is a very rich group of partners and well represented ○ Strength of state and local participation ○ Have periodic conference calls ○ Virtual meeting coming up next week ○ Workshop coming up in June ○ Will produce an initial draft, send it out to a broad list of stakeholders, ask for comments and also ask for anything they may have missed • SE Region Strategy Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sandy did a great job of putting it together ○ Had meeting up in Atlanta ○ Very good group ○ Appreciate Tom Quigley and Danny Lee's participation ○ A lot pushed to the states – Chair – Mike Zupko – NGA ○ Also decided not to break into Sub-regions



Meeting Notes

June 3, 2011

#	Topic
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Established a working group – David Frederick – Chair ○ Very diverse group ○ Have made assignments – asked them to use current information from risk assessments, etc. – identify gaps • Vicki Christiansen is going to be the acting director of legislative affairs for 3 to 4 months • Rich Lesko will be acting in Vicki's place • The chair posed the following questions to the WFEC members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are we missing anything? ○ Are we staying ahead of what is going on? ○ Are we redeeming our responsibilities? • Decision to move these to twice a month was good to keep us nimble • Will see if that is effective • Still have some open ended governance questions. E.g., where does the National Science Team fit in our governance structure • We need to be careful that we don't rubber stamp things <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Continue to recognize that each region has its own issues, etc. One size does not fit all ○ Let's not hurry and not have the quality product that we want ○ In Vicki's new job she may be able to tell our story related to timeline for the products due by the end of FY2012 • The important timeline is the end of 2012. But have to keep people with us in order to get to 2012. Need to show progress. Need to establish verifiable trust. Tangible evidence along the way. • Can understand our focus on the task at hand • Caution us to not allow the cohesive strategy (phases 2 and 3) to be the ONLY focus • There are other things associated with the cohesive strategy that WFEC can't lose sight of • Excited about moving forward • Keep an eye out to the future • Everyone is very enthusiastic and moving forward • Non-member comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Really appreciate WFEC ○ Think it is very important to have a vision for the outcome from the National Science Team and all the topical committees, etc. ○ Was there to be a WFEC review and approval of the workgroups? No – these groups work for the Regional Strategy Committees ○ Stay nimble and look out ahead ○ WFEC engagement in the work of the subcommittees is great <p><u>Decisions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WFEC members are all in agreement with assignment to CSSC and National Science Team (see below) <p><u>Actions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each RSC is to identify a Point of Contact to answer questions related to the webinars that the CSSC is developing. 2. Develop recommendations on the reporting structure between the CSSC, National Science Committee and WFEC. Include considerations and rationale for those recommendations. Final decision is with WFEC. Assigned to the CSSC and the National Science Team to report back to WFEC at their June 17 meeting



Meeting Notes

June 3, 2011

#	Topic
	3. Kirk will contact both the CSSC and National Science Team related to this assignment
4	<p>CSSC response to WFEC tasking – CS process requirements</p> <p><u>Description:</u> The Cohesive Strategy Subcommittee was tasked to develop recommendations on the questions posed by the Western Regional Strategy Committee.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> 1. Understand and approve the CSSC's recommendations</p> <p><u>Reference Material:</u> 1. Proposal to approve the CSSC Answers/Recommendations to WRSC questions</p> <p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The question around the use of the CRAFT process and the 24 questions has been answered and there is no need for a "decision" <p><u>Decisions:</u> None</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> None</p>
5	<p>DOD, DOA, DOI Report to Congress on Aerial Firefighting Resources</p> <p><u>Description:</u> Provide the Final DOD report to Congress on the Joint use of the C-130J for wildland firefighting. Provide a copy of HR1473 (DOD 2011 Appropriation) that requires a report to congress by Oct. 15.</p> <p>Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, the Chief of the Air Force Reserve, and the Director of the National Guard Bureau, in collaboration with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, the House Committee on Agriculture, the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, the House Committee on Natural Resources, and the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources a report of firefighting aviation assets.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> 1. Information</p> <p><u>Reference Material:</u> 1. Final Report to Congress – C-130J 2. HR 1473 requiring a report to Congress by Oct. 15</p> <p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These are some of the questions that WFEC should be engaged with in addition to the Cohesive Strategy DOD appropriation side – asked DOD, USFS and DOI to look into the viability to use assets to jointly operate new C-130J for the purpose of firefighting duties Several other questions submitted in committee language This is only the first of three such reports that have been asked for in Defense appropriations



Meeting Notes

June 3, 2011

#	Topic
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expect this type of language to continue to pop up • You will see in the report that the answer was “NO” • The DOD believe that the mission proposed was not viable • Formally transmitted two weeks ago to Interior and Agriculture • Does this only reference the C-130J <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Did not address in any way the usefulness of the C-130J ○ Focused on the procurement of the C-130Js specifically to fight fire ○ Should WFEC come up with a set of recommendations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NWCG has a group dealing with aviation issues – let’s use our existing resources ▪ One of the reasons we are looking for a national cohesive strategy is to identify issues and make recommendations. The aviation issue seems relevant to that effort ▪ There was agreement that we should use the committees we have established through NWCG ▪ NIAC is a good resource to us – the problem with large air tankers is not just with the USFS – the fire community relies on these resources – WFEC may want to contemplate the larger questions and develop recommendations to go to WFLC from a broader representation. Let’s not close the door on this yet. ▪ Get’s to the point on how we see ourselves and how WFLC sees WFEC. ▪ Attracted to the philosophy that we are still some time away for our nation to have a much more honest discussion on roles and responsibilities, authorities, etc. Then determine a much more efficient asset allocation. For example, we may have an excess of some asset as a nation. There is a more immediate question. Right now we can offer our opinion. The CS gives us a vehicle to identify our piece of the issue and how it ought to be divvied up. On the specific issue regarding if WFEC should develop a position on large air tankers...we should continue to have that conversation. Perhaps there are questions we should engage in and others that should be postponed until later. ▪ We should be able to balance the discussion within the boundary of the cohesive strategy. Would like to keep this on the table for future discussion. We should have a set of recommendations to go forward at the end of the CS. ▪ We should not shy away from issues just because they become political. We just need to go into it with our eyes open. The secretary of agriculture has a letter from Senator Feinstein demanding an airtanker plan. This will come up during meetings in mid-June ▪ NWCG has a lot of information that could/should be shared with WFEC – might be an opportunity to better channel some of that information to this group when it is relevant ▪ Related to the opportunity to dialogue with NWCG – can do that any time since they are a subcommittee of WFEC <p><u>Decisions:</u> None</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> None</p>
6	<p>Round Table Discussion</p> <p><u>Description:</u> WFEC members have the opportunity to share information with the committee and identify issues</p>



Meeting Notes

June 3, 2011

#	Topic
	<p>that may result in potential future agenda items.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understanding of activities within the members' organizations. <p><u>Reference Material:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None <p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes to publish in these meetings – capture opinions and perspectives – remove personal references • Appreciate the conversation about engaging the state, county and local stakeholders. Airtanker issue may be beyond the group. Clearly this may be part of an overall strategy. At what point do we engage in partnerships with Homeland Security, etc. • Glenn Gaines has been asked to sit on WFEC as well as WFLC to be part of the broad strategic focus • With respect to FACA – caution us on putting out more information just because other committees are doing that – can a WFEC member sit on a subcommittee as an alternate for a subcommittee member. Is that a WFEC decision? <p><u>Decisions:</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Actions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Roy will talk to FACA attorney and bring back the answer for the June 17 meeting 2. Can a WFEC member serve as an alternate or primary member on a subcommittee (Not representing WFEC) 3. If it is OK – WFEC will determine if that is a business practice for WFEC
7	<p>Public Comments</p> <p><u>Description:</u></p> <p>Time for WFEC to hear from the public. Specific topics to be determined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No public attending
8	<p>Closeout</p> <p><u>Description:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review the outcomes of this meeting 2. Review decision and actions 3. Identify potential agenda items for June 17 <p><u>Outcome:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreement on decisions and actions 2. Agreement on focus for next meeting <p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send agenda items to Shari for the June 17 WFEC meeting • One future agenda item is for WFEC to review the forsestsandrangeland.com website
9	<p>Adjourn</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting was adjourned at 11:36 by Tom Harbour, chair